

# THE REMONSTRANCE.

BOSTON.

The Remonstrance is published by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Extension of Suffrage to Women. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, New York, Maine, Illinois, and other States who believe that the great majority of their sex do not want the ballot, and that to force it upon them would not only be an injustice to women, but would lessen their influence for good and imperil the community. The Remonstrants ask a thoughtful consideration of their views in the interest of fair discussion.

## Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Extension of Suffrage to Women.

### EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

Mrs. James M. Codman.  
Mrs. J. Randolph Coolidge.  
Mrs. James N. Crafts.  
Miss Sarah H. Crocker.  
Mrs. James C. Flak.  
Miss E. H. Houghton.  
Miss Elise Johnson.  
Mrs. Francis C. Lowell.  
Mrs. Oliver W. Peabody.  
Mrs. Phillip H. Sears.  
Mrs. William T. Sedgwick.  
Mrs. G. H. Shaw.  
Miss E. P. Sohler.  
Mrs. Henry M. Whitney.  
Mrs. Charles E. Guild, Secretary, Edge Hill Road, Brookline.  
Laurence Minot, Treasurer, 89 Court Street, Boston.

### A BLUNDER IN NEW YORK.

At the last session of the New York Legislature, a resolution was adopted looking to the submission to the people of an amendment to the Constitution, conferring full suffrage upon women. The hope of the suffrage advocates was to secure favorable action by the Legislature this year, so that the proposition could be submitted next November.

It has been discovered, however, that the amendment was not properly drawn. The word "resident" was substituted for "citizen," an error which makes last year's action invalid. It will be necessary, therefore, for the suffragists to make a new beginning. Should they be successful in persuading the present Legislature to take favorable action upon an amend-

ment, the proposition will have to go over until 1898, when another Legislature will convene, before it can be brought to its second legislative stage.

If the present Legislature realizes the fact that in New York, as in Massachusetts and Connecticut, an overwhelming majority of the women do not want the ballot, it will be slow to yield to the suffragists' demands.

### THE MASSACHUSETTS "REFERENDUM."

THE history of the so-called "referendum" in Massachusetts on the question of granting municipal suffrage to women is interesting. The Legislature of 1895 passed an Act providing that there should be submitted, at the election in November, to all persons qualified to vote for school committee, the question: "Is it expedient that municipal suffrage be granted to women?" It was further provided that a separate count should be made of the votes cast by men and by women.

Here, it might have been thought, was the very opportunity for the suffragists. They had always claimed that they represented women, and that the demands which they made were the demands of the women of Massachusetts. The Legislature gave them the chance to demonstrate the truth of their position. If the majority of the women of the State wanted the ballot, all that they had to do was to go to the polls and say so by marking a cross upon a ballot, with the simple preliminary requirement of being registered. Yet leading suffragists opposed the bill: the Woman's Journal denounced it as a device of the enemy: and after it had been passed, several of the suffrage leaders waited upon the Governor to entreat him to veto it. This looked very much as if they were afraid of the consequences of an expression of public sentiment.

Although they derided the proposition as a "sham referendum," the suffragists set to work with zeal, after the bill became law, to bring out the largest possible vote in its favor. They formed organizations, held meetings, distributed literature, and

made an energetic canvass in every county of the State. On the other hand, women who do not want the ballot, represented by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Extension of Suffrage to Women, did not recommend women holding that view to express it at the polls, but urged them to use their influence to increase the vote of men against the proposition.

The official returns of the vote give the following result:—

	Men Voters.	Women Voters.
In favor of suffrage	86,970	22,204
Against suffrage	186,976	864

In round numbers, it is estimated that there are 575,000 women who were entitled to register and vote upon this question. The returns show that less than one in twenty-five of them went to the polls to express a wish to be given the municipal ballot.

The next time, therefore, that the Legislature of Massachusetts is asked to give municipal suffrage to women, it will have to consider the fact that a majority of one hundred thousand male voters have declared against the proposition, while less than four per cent. of the women of the State ask for it.

### NOT ANXIOUS FOR MORE.

SUCH experience as Canada has had with a very restricted form of municipal suffrage for women does not seem to incline public sentiment there toward an extension of woman's voting privileges.

In three of the provincial legislatures adverse action was taken last year on suffrage measures. The Nova Scotia Assembly defeated a bill giving the suffrage to unmarried women and widows having property qualifications. The adverse majority was 9. In the preceding year a similar bill was defeated by only two or three votes. In New Brunswick a bill conferring parliamentary suffrage on women was defeated. The Legislature of Quebec rejected a proposition to extend the franchise to widows and spinsters.

In the Dominion House of Commons, June 5, only 47 members voted in favor of extending the franchise to women, while 105 voted against the proposition

**"A SACRIFICE OF HAPPINESS."**

ONE of the objections often urged against woman suffrage is the apprehension that it would lead to domestic strife. Husbands and wives, it has been suggested, might differ so warmly upon political questions that the peace of the home might be imperilled. This is an objection which the advocates of suffrage have treated with special scorn. Nothing of the kind, they have insisted, would occur. Husbands and wives would be able to oppose each other vigorously in the caucuses and at the polls, and to defend widely different views of public questions without in the least interrupting the tranquility of the home circle.

It was not singular, therefore, that it occasioned some surprise when so eminent a suffrage leader as Mrs. Livermore, being asked to account for the fact that so many of the women in Massachusetts who might have voted on the suffrage "referendum" did not do so, gave the following explanation:—

"Do you wonder why so many of the women who registered did not go to the polls? I'll tell you why they didn't. They were afraid of their husbands. It meant a sacrifice of happiness, domestic happiness in many cases, to go to the polls. Let me tell you of something which happened to my own knowledge. A woman, a friend of mine, came to me Tuesday, and there were tears in her eyes. 'Mrs. Livermore,' she said, 'my husband has n't spoken to me for three weeks, since I registered.' That is the way, often and often."

If differences of opinion between husbands and wives on a mere abstract proposition without practical bearing were so sharp that it involved, as Mrs. Livermore says, a sacrifice of domestic happiness for women to go to the polls, what would be likely to happen if definite policies, individual candidates, and all the issues of a hotly contested national or municipal contest were involved? What would become of domestic happiness with husbands and wives violent partisans on opposing sides under such circumstances?

**WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN KANSAS.**

MR. E. WILDER, formerly a well-known citizen of Brookline, Massachusetts, but for some years a resident of Topeka, Kansas, wrote as follows in reply to a request for information regarding the practical workings of woman suffrage in that State:—

"We have the suffrage in Topeka for municipal elections, and one needs only to watch the successful efforts by free carriages and otherwise to secure the registration, and the voting of the vicious as well as the lower class, and observe the general unwillingness of the better classes of females to subject themselves to taking their turn in a long line of registration applicants of both sexes, and all conditions, to become satisfied that the result of the franchise will unquestionably be in favor of the worst side of politics."

"I probably cannot make my point plainer than by giving my personal experience in connection with our city election, which takes place next week."

"Being very much interested in the selection of proper officers, I induced one of the ladies of my family to vote at the primary, but upon my suggestion that she should go down and register so as to be able to vote at the main election, she declined emphatically, and my inclinations to further urge my wife and sister, born of my strong interest in the election, received an absolute quietus, when I went to the registration office to get my own certificate, and saw the line of applicants with whom they would have to take their turn."

Mr. Wilder's statement was criticised by enthusiastic suffragists; but the fact that the people of Kansas, after experimenting with municipal suffrage for women for years, voted down by a majority of nearly 35,000 a proposition to give them full suffrage, indicates that Mr. Wilder's view is that of the majority of Kansas citizens. No suffragist has yet explained why it is that, if municipal suffrage for women has been the success in Kansas which they claim it to have been, the State should have so emphatically refused to extend the suffrage further.

**NOT A WELL-FOUNDED CLAIM.**

THE Woman's Journal, some weeks in advance of the vote in Massachusetts upon the expediency of granting municipal suffrage to women, said:—

"After next November, therefore, Massachusetts suffragists will probably have a right to claim that they speak for a majority of the women."

Massachusetts suffragists have long been in the habit of making that claim, if not in words always, by implication. But what becomes of the claim, in view of the vote in November? About five hundred and seventy-five thousand women in Massachusetts were entitled to vote upon the "referendum" relating to

municipal suffrage, by simply registering themselves for that purpose. Out of these more than half a million women, how many said by their votes that they wanted the municipal ballot? Just 22,204.

The Massachusetts suffragists, therefore, so far from speaking for a majority of the women, as the Woman's Journal hopefully anticipated, actually speak for less than four per cent. of them.

**MUNICIPAL SUFFRAGE IN ENGLAND.**

So many misleading references are made to women's exercise of municipal suffrage in England, as if it furnished a parallel to municipal suffrage as demanded for women in this country, that it seems necessary repeatedly to call attention to the precise character of the suffrage given to English women. Mr. Albert Shaw, in his volume on Municipal Government in Great Britain, says:—

Every woman who is at the head of a family—that is, has no husband to act for her, or is at the head of a business, and pays up to a prescribed rate or tax—is given the right to vote for municipal officers, and also for parish officers; but such a person is not permitted to hold public office in the city government.

Under the Local Government Act of 1894, married as well as single women are allowed to vote for or to be chosen as parish councillors, guardians, or district councillors, or as members of the London vestries and district boards.

That is the extent of the suffrage, as given to English women. When this privilege, restricted in the main to tax-paying widows and single women and carrying with it disqualification for municipal offices, is compared with the right to vote for and to hold any municipal office, which is demanded for women in America, it is clear that they are very different things. It is disingenuous, to say the least, to confound them.

**AN ELEMENT OF DANGER.**

THIS is a consideration very closely affecting the question, which is, after all, simply a question of expediency and not of absolute right. Is it expedient to create a large potential vote which will not appear as an actual vote under usual conditions? Such a vote, which does not come out at the call of duty but needs the impulse of excitement of one sort or another, would be an element of danger in the community. It ought not to be added to the suffrage. — *Boston Commonwealth.*

## DO NOT WANT IT.

IN Connecticut cities and towns at no time have more than a handful of women exercised school suffrage, for which the suffragists, in their appeals to the Legislature, represented them as eager. Here are the returns of women's votes by counties, for three years:—

Counties.	1893.	1894.	1895.
Hartford . . . . .	1,293	1,186	689
New Haven . . . . .	973	949	570
New London . . . . .	364	373	185
Fairfield . . . . .	273	193	126
Windham . . . . .	176	182	148
Litchfield . . . . .	159	85	50
Middlesex . . . . .	60	136	101
Tolland . . . . .	372	137	37
Totals . . . . .	3,806	3,241	1,906

Do women want the ballot? In Massachusetts last year less than four per cent. of them said so. In Connecticut, in the same year, only a little more than one per cent. of the women exercised the right of school suffrage, which had been given them three years before.

And yet the advocates of woman suffrage profess to speak for women.

## IS MAN WOMAN'S ENEMY?

MRS. ELIZABETH CADY STANTON, in undertaking, in connection with other women of advanced ideas, the work known as *The Woman's Bible*, deemed it necessary to explain the motive which prompted a new commentary upon the Scriptures. She found, on examination, that woman constituted only one eleventh part of the Bible as ordinarily received, and she sought to relieve this disproportion. Of the Trinity, for example, her work gives this version:—

Instead of three male personages, a mother, father, and son would seem more rational. The first step in the elevation of woman to her true position in the scale of being is the recognition by the rising generation of a heavenly mother, to whom their prayers should be addressed as well as to the heavenly Father.

In brief, Mrs. Stanton expressed as follows her opinion of the utility of her revision:—

To take a materialistic view of the matter, in the progress of the race from savagery to civilization, woman has been kept in an inferior position. She still occupies it now that an advanced state of civilization has been attained. One thing that keeps her there is the misinterpretation of the Bible as regards woman. The correction of this will restore her and *deprive her enemy, man, of a reason for his oppression* and a weapon of attack.

Dismissing all consideration of the scholarly value of this work, the expres-

sion which we print in italics is significant enough to deserve notice. Casually, and perhaps inadvertently, Mrs. Stanton uses an expression which naively describes the idea which actuates herself and many other suffrage leaders. It is to "deprive her enemy, man, of a reason for his oppression" that woman is urged to enlist in the movement.

But is it true that man is the "enemy" of woman? Is it true that in this country, at the end of the nineteenth century, man is eagerly seeking reasons for the "oppression" of women? And if this conception of the relations of the sexes is wholly false, misleading, and unjust, what shall be said of the movement which takes such a conception for its motive?

## TAXPAYING WOMEN NOT ANXIOUS TO VOTE.

THE claim for woman suffrage often is based on the argument that women who are taxpayers ought to have the right to vote. The validity of this argument is impeached by the fact that it is not shown either that taxpaying women want to vote or that they suffer injury because they do not vote; and by the further fact that it is nowhere proposed in this country to limit the suffrage, if granted to women, to those who are taxpayers.

As bearing upon this phase of the question, Mrs. W. Winslow Crannell, in a letter in the Albany Evening Journal some time ago, stated that nearly every taxpaying woman in that city had signed a petition against woman suffrage. Mrs. Crannell added:—

Where women have the right to express themselves by ballot they fail to do so. I refer to the women who are stockholders in the banks of our city. Of the 500 stockholders in the New York State, the Mechanics' and Farmers', the Commercial, the City and the Exchange banks, 230 are women. These banks are spoken of as they are the five oldest banks in Albany, not one of them having been in existence less than a half century; and yet no woman has ever entered one of them to cast her vote for the officers who shall have charge of her property.

That there does not exist, under the American system, any connection between property and suffrage is clearly shown in the following statement by Mrs. Schuyler Van Rensselaer:—

"The more property a man has, the more he is taxed. But whether he owns ten million dollars, or nothing at all, he

has only a single vote. Although he may own property and pay taxes in a dozen different States, he may vote only in one State, in one town. Paying taxes in California and paying none in New York, he must vote in New York, if he resides there, or not at all. Moreover, a man may have paid ten thousand dollars a year in taxes since the year when he was born, but he has no vote until he has lived for twenty-one years, nor do those who are meanwhile responsible for his property vote in his name. This is enough to show how alien from the spirit of our laws and our habits of political thought is any relationship between property and the suffrage."

## LOSING GROUND IN NEW ENGLAND.

THAT the movement for woman suffrage is losing ground in New England is indicated by recent votes in the Legislatures.

In Vermont, for example, in 1892, the House passed a municipal suffrage bill—yeas 149, nays 83. In 1894 the House, after defeating a similar bill by a vote of 106 to 108, refused reconsideration, 96 to 124. In other words, a favorable majority of 66 in 1892 was changed into an adverse majority of 28 in 1894.

In Massachusetts, in 1894, the House passed a municipal suffrage bill by a vote of 119 to 107. In 1895 the House defeated a similar bill—yeas 97, nays 137.

In all of the other New England States suffrage bills were defeated in 1895. In Maine the House passed a municipal suffrage bill, and the Senate killed it. Two years before the Senate passed a similar bill, and the House killed it. In New Hampshire the House, by a vote of 108 to 185, refused a third reading to a municipal suffrage bill. In Connecticut the Senate rejected a municipal suffrage bill which the House had passed; and in Rhode Island a proposition for a suffrage amendment was referred to the next Legislature.

## A CHANGE OF STATUS.

IN all the discussions on woman suffrage both parties seem to have overlooked, to a singular degree, the enormous property privileges of women over men, which would be inevitably sacrificed if women had the ballot.

It must be acknowledged that no suffragist so far has contemplated in the least the giving up of any of these property privileges. But equality and privileges cannot exist side by side, and women must choose which they prefer—the positive benefit of the laws as they stand, or the possible benefit of the ballot, with the certainty that they will have to abandon their privileged position.—*Molly Elliot Seawell, in Harper's Bazar.*

## THE SUFFRAGE "REFERENDUM."

THE VOTE ANALYZED BY THE MAN SUFFRAGE ASSOCIATION.

EVERY COUNTY AND EVERY CONGRESSIONAL, COUNCILLOR, SENATORIAL, AND REPRESENTATIVE DISTRICT AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

To the People of Massachusetts:—

AFTER twenty-five years of agitation by the suffragists the question of municipal suffrage for women has been brought to a test. The voters have been asked their opinion and have given an emphatic reply.

Never before has there been so full an expression of opinion upon any question submitted to the people of Massachusetts. The vote for governor at the State election was 328,121. The vote of the men upon municipal woman suffrage was 273,976. Over eighty-three per cent. of those voting for governor voted upon this question, while upon the most important amendment to the Constitution since the war, that abolishing the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting, only sixty-one per cent. of those voting for governor voted on the amendment.

Never before has any question submitted to the people of Massachusetts received so overwhelming a defeat. The vote of the men was: "No," 186,976; "Yes," 87,000,—a "No" majority of 99,976, only 24 short of a round 100,000. The vote in 1889 on the prohibition amendment to the Constitution was: "No," 131,062; "Yes," 85,242,—a "No" majority of 45,820. So that the majority against woman suffrage in Massachusetts is more than twice as great as that against prohibition.

The vote of the women on the suffrage question: "Yes," 22,204; "No," 864, is as significant as that of the men. By the census of 1895 the number of men in Massachusetts qualified to register and vote is 561,699. The number of women qualified to register and vote on this question was at least 575,000. Of these more than 550,000 declined to vote, and less than four in a hundred voted "Yes." In other words, more than 96 per cent. of the women of the Commonwealth either prefer the present status of the suffrage, or are wholly indifferent in the matter.

In 47 towns not one woman voted "Yes," and in 138 other towns the women voting "Yes" numbered fifteen or less. As the vast majority of the women opposed to the suffrage expressed their opinion by refusing to vote, the women's vote, for purposes of tabulation, has little value. In the following statement of votes, therefore, the votes of the men alone are considered:—

Massachusetts has 31 cities and 322 towns. Of the 31 cities every one cast a large majority against woman suffrage. The vote of the cities was: "No," 120,657; "Yes," 54,012,—a "No" majority of 66,645. Many people have thought

## RECENT DEFEATS OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

IN 1893.

Municipal suffrage bills were defeated in Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, North Dakota, and South Dakota. Full suffrage bills were defeated in Arizona and New Mexico. A township suffrage bill was defeated in Illinois, a license suffrage bill in Connecticut, and a village suffrage bill in New York. The Supreme Courts of Michigan and New York gave decisions adverse to suffrage laws. In the United States Senate a proposition to permit women to vote at municipal elections in the Cherokee Outlet was defeated, 9 to 40.

IN 1894.

In Massachusetts, a municipal suffrage bill was passed by the House, but was defeated in the Senate.

In New York, a proposition to submit to the people an amendment to the Constitution, striking out the word "male," was defeated in the Constitutional Convention, August 15, yeas 58, nays 97.

In Kansas, a constitutional amendment giving to women full rights of suffrage was defeated at the election, November 6, by a majority of 34,827.

In Vermont, the House, after first acting favorably on a municipal suffrage bill, rejected it by a close vote, and subsequently by a majority of 28 refused to reconsider this action.

In Iowa, the Senate defeated a proposition to submit a suffrage constitutional amendment to the people.

IN 1895.

In California, bills for municipal suffrage and for full suffrage for women failed; but a joint resolution was passed submitting to the people in 1896 a suffrage constitutional amendment.

In Connecticut, a municipal suffrage bill was passed by the House, but rejected by the Senate. A Presidential suffrage bill did not reach a vote.

In Illinois, a bill conferring upon women the right of township suffrage was twice defeated by the Senate.

In Indiana, a constitutional amendment, striking the word "male" from the Constitution of the State, was introduced, but secured no support and was not reported by the committee to which it was referred.

In Kansas, a bill was passed by the Senate giving full suffrage to nine women who had petitioned for it, and who were named in the bill. The Senate also passed a bill conferring upon women the right to vote for Presidential electors. Neither bill reached a vote in the House.

In Maine, the House passed a bill conferring municipal suffrage upon women, but the Senate defeated it; yeas 11, nays 15.

In Massachusetts, the House refused a third reading to a bill conferring municipal suffrage upon women. The vote, including pairs, was: Yeas, 97; nays, 137. An Act was passed permitting all persons qualified to vote for school committee to express their opinion at the State election by voting Yes or No to the question "Is it expedient that municipal suffrage be granted to women?" When the election took place the men voters voted against the proposition more than two to one, and only about four per cent. of the women of the State voted in favor of it. The vote of the men was: Yes, 86,970; No, 186,976; of the women, Yes, 22,204; No, 864.

In Michigan, a proposition to submit a woman suffrage amendment to the Constitution was defeated.

In Missouri, February 25, a resolution providing for submitting a woman suffrage amendment to the Constitution was defeated in the House, 43 to 65.

In Montana, a resolution for the submission of a suffrage amendment was defeated in the Senate.

In North Dakota, a bill conferring full suffrage upon women, subject to a referendum to the people, was defeated by the House.

In Rhode Island, a resolution for a constitutional amendment was referred to the next Legislature.

In South Dakota, the House tabled a resolution providing for submitting a constitutional amendment which the Senate had adopted.

In Washington, a resolution for a constitutional amendment was adopted by the Senate, but defeated by the House.

In Wisconsin, April 13, a municipal suffrage bill was defeated in the Assembly; yeas, 33; nays, 49.

that the vote against woman suffrage was disproportionately heavy in the cities, but this was not so. The vote of the 322 towns was: "No," 66,319; "Yes," 32,988,—a "No" majority of 33,331. The cities of Massachusetts contain two thirds of the population of the State, and in an even distribution of sentiment should therefore contribute two thirds of the "No" majority. That is what they have done, and the closeness of the figures to an exact two thirds is remarkable. Of the 322 towns 293 voted "No," 28 voted "Yes," and 1 was a tie. The 28 towns voting "Yes" were among the very smallest in the State, their vote averaging only, "Yes" 51, "No" 42.

Every county and every congressional, councillor, senatorial, and representative

district in the Commonwealth cast a majority against the proposition.

In view of such a result it would seem that further agitation of the question at present is uncalled for.

For the Executive Committee,

FRANCIS C. LOWELL, *Chairman*.

CHARLES R. SAUNDERS, *Secretary*.

(Amended returns of the vote of the men at the State election in Massachusetts, the question of municipal suffrage for women, filed in the office of the Secretary of the Commonwealth, show a loss of 30 votes for the suffragists, making the total vote of the men stand: "No," 186,976; "Yes," 86,970,—a majority against woman suffrage of 100,006.)